

citizens, foreign news media and the non-governmental organizations, which are increasingly influential in shaping international policy- and opinion-making. These recommendations are intended to help our diplomats communicate more effectively with people other than just their official counterparts and help them recognize and understand foreign attitudes and thinking.

In 1996, for example, the advisory commission issued a series of recommendations under the publication "A New Diplomacy for the Information Age," which called for the combination of the State Department's expertise in dealing with foreign states and USIA's expertise in dealing with foreign publics to maximize the "edge" we enjoy in information and communications technology. Subsequently, the advisory commission made additional recommendations in the report entitled "Publics and Diplomats in the Global Communications Age," which called for more public diplomacy training for all diplomats and establishing a permanent interagency coordinating body to develop and implement diplomatic communication strategies.

The advisory commission's reports illustrate how the increase in global communications and technology makes foreign publics far more important than ever and why we should use our advanced skills in these areas to inform, understand and influence those foreign publics. Last year's report, for instance, explains how Saddam Hussein used public diplomacy to his advantage when he shifted the focus of the world media from his arsenal of weapons of mass destruction to the tragic suffering of Iraqi children, a campaign that did nothing to help the United States build the same coalition in 1998 as assembled against Saddam's sinister regime in 1991. The advisory commission's report, which can be accessed via USIA's web page, also includes intelligent and thoughtful recommendations on how to deal with such problems in the future. I believe this represents one of the most important advisory functions of the commission, and I encourage my colleagues to read the report.

While the State Department reorganization section of the omnibus appropriations legislation retained the advisory commission to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, it eliminated the advisory commission to USIA—a much larger agency. It is important to indicate that there was no provision for the elimination of the advisory commission in the bill as originally passed by the conference committee deliberating the State Department reorganization bill. However, since the omnibus appropriations legislation was not opened for amendments, it was not in order to vote on the advisory commission's continuance. That was not a fair consideration of its future, and it certainly does not represent good public policy concerning our diplomatic and foreign policy goals.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department consolidation is an overdue reinvention of the U.S. foreign policy establishment for the information age. This reorganization can help us take advantage of our edge in information and technology by using public diplomacy. During the transition period involving USIA's merger into the State Department, the advisory commis-

sion's role would be significant as the two cultures learn to work with one another. The advisory commission has a proven track record in making recommendations to Congress and the Administration in support of this strategy and making it work. It is simply not enough to train our diplomats about the language and culture of a foreign country. Nor should they be trained as narrowly focused and secretive specialists who fail to grasp the extent to which the world has changed around them. Rather, we must help them take advantage of the ever-increasing breadth of information and technology in order to effectively reach out and express our message and principles concerning democracy, human rights, free markets and American traditional values. The advisory commission should be continued, and for these reasons I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation.

THE DUMPING OF CHEAP, ILLEGAL STEEL IN U.S. MARKETS BY JAPAN, BRAZIL, AND RUSSIA

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1999

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of legislation to be introduced by Representative VISCLOSKEY, imposing steel import quotas on countries that are dumping steel in our markets, and by Representative TRAFICANT, to impose a short-term ban on steel imports in the foreseeable future. I also support Representative REGULA's bill calling for immediate changes in the Section 201 procedures used to indicate or prove that foreign imports are causing grave injury to industries and workers in the United States.

The jobs of steel workers are at risk: 10,000 have already lost their jobs, and 24 more will be pushed out of the workplace every day the steel dumping continues.

In 1998 alone, 18 million tons of foreign steel poured into the United States—12.4 million in the third quarter alone. This represents 56 percent more than the third quarter in 1997.

By contrast, America exported a mere 5.5 tons of domestic steel in 1998—the same period in which Russia, Brazil, and Japan unloaded the exact same 5.5 tons of hot-rolled steel imports here.

The United States Steel industry adds \$70 billion a year to the gross domestic product—and you can put a face on that \$70 billion if you think about the thousands of steel workers—their spouses and children—who will suffer even more if we continue to allow illegal steel dumping from foreign markets into ours—for there will be no jobs, no house mortgage or car payment, and no hope for their continued quality of life.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the Administration to take care of Americans—and American jobs.

I do not intend to demean the Banana industry—those workers have to be able to earn a living too—but if the President will do for steel what he has done on behalf of bananas, then all will be well.

There have been times in our history when a resource vital to the United States was threatened by foreign producers, and it could happen again. Steel is a vital resource to our national security—our military complex. If we are forced to rely on foreign producers to provide our steel, the entire industry will fold and we could find ourselves held hostage once again.

Mr. Speaker, somebody needs to tell the Administration that it is steel on which our military depends for its weapons and equipment in times of crisis, not bananas, and he must act to stop steel dumping now.

21ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA ANTI-SMOKING WRITING CONTEST

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1999

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address an issue of great importance to my constituents in Kern and Tular counties, and indeed, all Americans: teen smoking. Each year, millions of young people begin smoking and become addicted. The question we have to ask ourselves as lawmakers is "why?" Many schools have anti-smoking programs; the health risks are clearly printed on every pack of cigarettes; it is illegal for anyone under the age of 18 to purchase tobacco products. Why, then, if students are told in school not to smoke, if we all understand that smoking is dangerous and addictive, and if it is against the law for young people to smoke, do more than one million of our children choose to begin smoking each year?

I wanted to get an accurate assessment of which anti-smoking programs are working and which are not, so I invited fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students in my district to submit their ideas in an essay contest. I asked them to tell me, in their very best writing, the reasons they might choose not to start smoking, ways in which they, their parents, and their schools could discourage other young people from smoking, and finally, I asked them what, if anything, Congress can do on this issue. I read many good ideas from hundreds of students throughout my district on all three points.

Many students proudly took personal responsibility for this decision, saying that the decision not to begin smoking is ultimately left to individuals. Some suggested the creation of new anti-smoking programs in schools, such as one proposed by Eddie Mota, a fifth grader from Panama Elementary School in Bakersfield. Eddie suggested that schools create a program called "Smoking Detour, so that kids won't make the wrong turn." Another idea came from Ashley Cullins, a sixth grader at James Monroe Middle School in Ridgecrest, California, who thinks that communities should create and support anti-smoking clubs.

A lot of students pointed to their parents as the strongest influences in making the decision not to smoke. Britney Lout, a sixth grader at California City Middle School said that it is parents', and not a school's responsibility to

tell children the dangers of smoking. Similarly, George Montoya, a seventh grader at Sequoia Middle School in Bakersfield, said that parents should begin teaching their children not to smoke at an early age.

Students presented several interesting, creative ideas as to what Congress could do to eliminate teen smoking. Christopher Duck, an eighth grader at Visalia Christian Academy, proposed stronger penalties for merchants caught selling cigarettes to minors, and creating a limit on the amount of nicotine in cigarettes. And James Margrave, a sixth grade student at Quailwood Elementary School in Bakersfield, wants smoking in movies and television shows to be banned. These are a small sample of the outstanding ideas I heard from students in my district. This is an issue that young people care about very deeply, and I hope that any action we take will consider such options.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the full text of the essays submitted by the six students mentioned above.

Smoking causes harm to your body. The tobacco in cigarettes can turn your lungs black. Tobacco can cause you to get cancer and heart disease. Tobacco can make you think unclearly and unable to sleep. Smoking can make you sick and make you die. Kids should be taught about the harmful effects of smoking.

Schools should have a class or programs for students on the bad things smoking can do. The classes should show the students examples of a healthy lung and a black lung. Parents should also teach their kids about smoking at an early age, like eleven years. If one of my friends asked me to smoke, I would say no because I am not a stupid person. I would tell an adult that my friend has cigarettes.

I learned about the awful things smoking can do to your body. I've decided I'd rather live a smoke free life and not die young from lung cancer. I think that Congress should raise the price of cigarettes so that kids could not afford them. Then people would not die from smoking.—George Montoya, seventh grade student, Sequoia Middle School, Bakersfield, California.

Smoking is an option and only one person can make the decision to smoke, and that's you. I personally decided not to begin smoking because I plan on going places with my life and if I start smoking, I won't be able to fulfill my plans. Smoking can become a very bad habit and I don't want to make it a personal habit of mine. My grandmother influenced me not to smoke because I saw how addicted she got and I don't want to be like that.

"Home is where the heart is," and that's where parents should be telling their children how bad smoking can be. No matter the age, from the beginning, children should never want to smoke. Parents can be very skeptical about who their children hang around, but they can't control what their children do when they aren't around so they should be sure to let their children know all they should know. Schools can't search every child every day because it's useless, but every child should have to take health classes to show just how unhealthy smoking is. Friends shouldn't smoke around friends, so that they can't influence others. The only thing Congress can do to stop the use of cigarettes is to stop making cigarettes altogether. People shouldn't be smoking, no matter who they are.—Britney Lout, seventh

grade student, California City Middle School, California City, California.

I believe there are many factors which influence a child to smoke. I have decided not to use any tobacco products due, in part to the government, the D.A.R.E. program, teachers, school counselors, parents, and my church. The government's programs supported my decision not to smoke. The D.A.R.E. program taught me about drugs and ways to say "no" to them. Posters and ads showing pictures of a smoker's lung and a healthy lung helped me to realize how harmful tobacco and drugs are. Advertisements on television also showed me some harmful effects of cigarettes and drugs. They showed that tar in cigarettes is the same as on the roads. My school counselors and teachers played a big role in keeping me from smoking. They taught me why tobacco and other drugs are harmful. My parents set a good example by not using tobacco products. I feel I might disappoint them if I started to smoke. My parents and church set good examples for me to follow. They taught by example to resist drugs. We have had family discussions and talked about why I should not smoke.

I have two suggestions the government can adopt to help kids decide not to smoke. First, create mentor programs that pair "at risk" kids with older, smoke-free kids to encourage the younger kids not to smoke. Second, celebrities can talk to children about not smoking. These people are often more listened to than teachers, counselors, and even parents.—Chris Burnett, seventh grade student, Earl Warren Junior High School, Bakersfield, California

I have decided to never begin smoking and I was influenced most by the assemblies at our school during Red Ribbon Week for the last seven years at Quailwood, my school. I want to become a Major League Baseball player and try to catch Mark McGwire and his home run record and I have figured from all of those assemblies that if I want to do that, I can't start smoking, doing drugs, or drinking. I don't know if it was watching the K9 unit come every year to talk to us, but since that first assembly in kindergarten, I've decided to never start smoking.

Even though I've decided not to smoke, some of my friends have not. I don't want them to ruin their lives so there are a couple of things that schools, parents, and I could do to keep my friends from beginning to smoke. There are many things that schools could do to help kids try not to start smoking. When I was in kindergarten, first grade, and second grade, a lady used to come in and show us a pig's lung that had been around a lot of smoke, almost like a person who smoked. It was horrible looking. She said that if we smoked, our lungs would look like that, and no one wants to have their lungs look like that. I think that all schools should do that, and not only in the first three years of school, but throughout elementary school.

Parents could also help their children not start smoking. Parents could talk to their kids more about saying no to smoking. Tell them how bad it is for your body and what it does to your brain. If kids knew those things it might lessen their chance of smoking. All parents should be good role models. My mom and dad don't smoke and I have no desire to smoke either. They probably had an influence on me not to smoke. Kids might think it's O.K. to smoke if their parents do. There are also many things I could do to help my friends not start smoking. I could tell my friends that if they ever started to smoke,

they wouldn't be my friends anymore. I also could tell my friends that if they ever thought about smoking to talk to me because I'd always be open to listen to them. I'd do practically anything to stop my friends from starting to smoke.

Those are all things that schools, parents, and I could do to stop kids from starting to smoke, but there are things Congress could do to stop, or at least to reduce the use of tobacco. They could make laws to stop advertising smoking on billboards and in magazines. The tobacco industry tries to make smoking look cool when it's not. Congress could make a law that there shouldn't be smoking on television and in movies. The other day, I saw my favorite actor with a cigarette in his mouth. If I didn't know smoking killed you, I'd probably want to smoke too, because then I could be just like him. The only thing this is doing to kids is influencing us to smoke when we get older. Another law Congress could make to reduce tobacco use is to ban candy cigarettes and gum that look like chewing tobacco. When kids like me see that stuff, it's great; it tastes good, and when we get older, we may want the real thing.—James Margrave, sixth grade student, Quailwood Elementary School, Bakersfield, California

When I was young, I was watching the news with my mother. It was about smoking. The program was about the problems smoking causes. I was watching it closely and I was scared that I was going to have those problems. Although I was scared, I never realized how hard it was going to be to make this decision later on. Here in the sixth grade, I know I will never have to do this.

To help other people make the same decision, small groups from communities need to form clubs for kids aged 11–19 years to have fun and to be safe. In this club there should be no smoking. This group should do things involving kids. It could get money from donations and fundraisers.

I don't think Congress can do too much to reduce smoking. It basically is up to the community and to each person. Some people might disagree and even fight over this matter. Personally I made this decision already, but some kids think it's cool to smoke and they won't stop. Instead of arguing over this, we need to do more educating to show kids that smoking isn't cool.—Ashley Cullins, sixth grade student, James Monroe Middle School, Ridgecrest, California

Tobacco has been a health hazard to America for years, yet, even when they know its dangers, kids still choose to smoke for the chance to be "cool." Somehow, all the programs, clubs, and classes are not getting the message through. Hopefully, the essays being received will give Congress new ideas that will help America become a better place.

There are many influences that have affected my decision not to start smoking. One such influence is the warnings of smoking's dangers. The fact that smoking can cause numerous cancers and can cause a person to stop breathing is a frightening thought. Being brought up in a drug-free environment and then visiting places with a high content of smoke has given me a good picture of the two different worlds—a good enough picture to make me realize which one is the best for me and the people around me.

I believe that there are a few ways that schools and Congress can make a difference. I think the schools would help if they provided a mandatory class to discuss the dangers and consequences of smoking and tobacco. Then there are a couple of ways I feel

Congress can help prevent tobacco use. First, Congress should pass a law that reduces the amount of nicotine put into tobacco products. Second, Congress should raise and enforce penalties on minors who smoke, and on those who sell tobacco to minors. Raising the taxes on tobacco products would only lead to more thievery and, therefore should not take place.

I hope that these essays have given Congress a better view of the tobacco problem, and I hope that they will put into effect some of the ideas these essays offer. May the Lord have His hand on this situation as we all look and pray for a better America.—Christopher Duck, eighth grade student, Visalia Christian Academy, Visalia, California

I see many store advertisements that encourage people to smoke. Thanks to our Congress, there are no gun advertisements, and Congress should be just as tough on cigarette ads. I would say that guns and tobacco are deadly weapons; one kills fast and the other kills slow. I think that Congress can do many things to keep kids from smoking. Congress and schools should make a program called "smoking detour," to keep kids from making the wrong turn. This program would take kids on a hospital tour to visit patients that are dying from cancer caused by tobacco. How sad it would be to see people with tubes stuck in their noses and pictures of rotten lungs. That sure would discourage me from smoking.

My mom and dad are the best advertisements against smoking. They don't smoke. They tell me, "if you smoke, it will kill you and it will hurt those who love you." Even though I live in a free country, where I have the freedom to smoke, I don't have the right to hurt the freedom of life. I love my family, friends, and my life too much to smoke.—Eddie Mota, fifth grade student, Panama Elementary School, Bakersfield, California

FAIRNESS FOR OUR NATION'S DAIRY FARMERS

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1999

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 444, the "Dairy Promotion Fairness Act," a bill that would create a little more fairness for our Nation's dairy farmers.

We have all enjoyed the recent "Got Milk?" promotions sponsored by the National Dairy Promotion and Research Board. Those commercials remind the public that milk is both good for you, and, frankly, good to have around when you're eating chocolate chip cookies.

All American dairy farmers pay into the Dairy Promotion Program. But there are a group of people who gain from the program, but don't pay for it. Importers of foreign dairy products. Whether it's cheese from France, or non-fat powdered milk from New Zealand, importers receive free advertisements of their products, paid for by our dairy producers. That just isn't fair to our farmers.

Importers of dairy products are the only commodity importers that don't pay into a promotion program. Importers of pork, beef, and cotton are all required to support their respec-

tive promotion programs. The Dairy Promotion program should not be treated differently, and our domestic dairy products should not have to subsidize the promotion of foreign dairy products. I urge all members who believe our farmers deserve fairness to support this bill.

IN MEMORY OF ADMIRAL HAROLD E. SHEAR

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1999

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with sorrow following the passing of Admiral Harold E. Shear of Groton, Connecticut on February 1, 1999. Admiral Shear served his country in the United States Navy for more than four decades and helped to create the modern ballistic missile submarine force which serves as an indispensable element of our national defense.

At age 10, Harold Shear began his long career at sea by working on his step-father's fishing boat. He entered the U.S. Naval Academy in 1938. His class of midshipmen graduated five months early due to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. After a brief tour aboard a surface ship, Harold Shear joined the submarine service. Over the course of the next twenty five years, he was promoted through the chain of command in the submarine force. He served as commanding officer of the diesel-powered submarine U.S.S. *Becuna* (SS 319) and the nuclear ballistic missile sub U.S.S. *Patrick Henry* (SSBN 599). During the Cuban missile crisis Harold Shear served as ballistic missile submarine officer on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In this capacity, he ensured that our force was mobilized quickly in order to demonstrate to the Russians that the United States was prepared to take all steps necessary to remove offensive nuclear weapons from the island.

In 1967, Harold Shear was promoted to Rear Admiral. Throughout the early 1970s he served in a series of high-level Naval positions, including commander-in-chief of U.S. Naval Forces in Europe. In 1975, Admiral Shear was appointed Vice Chief of Naval Operations—the second highest ranking Navy officer in the nation. In his final assignment, Admiral Shear served as commander-in-chief of Allied Forces in southern Europe. He retired from the Navy in 1980.

Admiral Harold Shear served his country with honor and distinction in the Navy for more than forty years. However, he continued to serve his community well after retirement. He played a crucial role in an effort joined by many across southeastern Connecticut to revitalize the port of New London. Admiral Shear worked closely with me and others to convince the Navy to transfer State Pier to Connecticut. Then, he pushed the State to rebuild it and convert it into an international commercial center. Thanks to Admiral Shear's dedication, the Pier today is busy with activity as goods from across Connecticut and New England are loaded onto ships bound for destinations across the globe.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Harold Shear was an American hero. He defended this nation during

some of the darkest hours of our history. He was one of the architects and chief strategists of the modern ballistic missile submarine force. He was an advocate for maritime trade. Having been awarded the Silver Star for conspicuous gallantry in action and Navy Distinguished Service Medal with Gold Star along with many other honors, it is entirely fitting that Admiral Shear will be buried with other great Americans in Arlington National Cemetery. The nation says goodbye to a great leader while southeastern Connecticut bids farewell to friend and neighbor.

THE WAGE GAP

HON. MICHAEL R. McNULTY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1999

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I call upon this Congress to address a major concern of single mothers, working women and working families. The wage gap in America between men and women has been overlooked for far too long.

While women in America have made great strides in the workplace, on average, they earn only 75 cents to a man's dollar.

This issue goes beyond simply ensuring what is equal and right, and has long-lasting economic impacts on our society. While more and more women have become the primary source of family income, the total amount of wages women lost last year due to pay inequity was over \$130 billion.

Single mothers and working families realize the entire family would be better off if women were being paid what they are worth and have rightly earned.

This Congress can continue the commitment to equality by removing the economic barriers which hinder too many women and their families.

That is why I have decided to co-sponsor the "Paycheck Fairness Act", sponsored by Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro. I urge all members of the Congress, and all my fellow Americans to recognize and address this very serious issue.

HONESTY IN BUDGETING ACT

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1999

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the "Honesty in Budgeting Act." This is an important bill that I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting.

Right now, the public and elected officials alike are confused about our federal budget. Both President Clinton and the Republican Congressional leadership said we had a budget surplus last year, but the national debt still increased. The public asked, how could we have a surplus but still increase the debt? That is a good question.

The answer is that we didn't really have a surplus last year. We had a \$29 billion deficit